

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(e) as be anticipated by Eytchison (U.S. Patent No. 6,363,434). Claim 1 has been amended, support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 2, lines 1-17. Claim 6 has been canceled without prejudice. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 3-5 and 7 are pending.

Further, In the Office Action, the Examiner suggested adding headings to the specification. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's suggestion, however respectfully declines to add the headings as they are not required in accordance with MPEP §608.01(a).

On the merits, applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims, as amended, are patentable for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a home network comprising: a plurality of network nodes, wherein at least two of said nodes have different data formats; and a software system distributed over the plurality of network nodes, wherein the software system enables (1) a virtual storage device to manage allocation of data to respective real storage devices of respective network nodes, (2) storage and/or retrieval of data in the real storage devices

irrespective of the type of network node, (3) exclusive storage of data by a user on the virtual storage device , and (4) a user to manage data of the different data formats without knowledge of which real storage devices the data has been stored.

Applicants respectfully submit that Eytchison does not teach a software system that enables (1) a virtual storage device to manage allocation of data to respective real storage devices of respective network nodes, (2) storage and/or retrieval of data in the real storage devices irrespective of the type of network node, (3) exclusive storage of data by a user on the virtual storage device , and (4) a user to manage data of the different data formats without knowledge of which real storage devices the data has been stored.

The Office Action indicates that Eytchison teaches a user to manage data of the different data formats in Fig. 3, Col. 6, line 34 – Col. 7, line 19. However, Eytchison require a user to indicate the “source device, the destination device and the requested action.” See col. 6, lines 64-68. Thus, it does not teach a user to manage data of the different data formats without knowledge of which real storage devices the data has been stored, as specified in amended claim 1.

Since Eytchison or Lea, does not teach, show or suggest all of the features of amended independent claim 1, as recited above, applicant respectfully submits that this claim is patentable over this reference.

Claims 3-5 and 7 in this application are dependent from claim 1 discussed above and is, therefore, believed allowable and patentable for at least the same reasons.



The applicants have made a sincere attempt to advance the prosecution of this application by reducing the issues for consideration and specifically delineating the zone of patentability. The applicants submit that the claims, as they now stand, fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 102. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Mail all correspondence to:
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
580 White Plains Road
Tarrytown, NY 10591

for Daniel Piotrowski, Reg. 42,079
Attorney for Applicants
Phone (914) 333-9624
Fax: (914) 332-0615

RECEIVED

By:
Rick de Pinho
Reg. 41,703

FEB 05 2004
Technology Center 2600

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

It is hereby certified that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA. 22313-1450

On January 29, 2004

By *Rick de Pinho*

Rick de Pinho, Reg. 41,703